

February 24, 2003

Mr. Paul Nelson GreenTeam/Zanker 301 Carl Road Sunnyvale, CA 94089

RE: Response to Proposal from GreenTeam/Zanker

Dear Mr. Nelson,

Thank you for your proposal of January 24, 2003 suggesting that we consider changes to the operating agreement in the areas of diversion incentive levels and revenue sharing. We appreciate that GreenTeam/Zanker continues to examine approaches to decreasing tonnage delivered to the landfill.

Each of the SMaRT Station partner cities have met the waste reduction goals set in AB939, and continue to support many programs that contribute to waste reduction, including the SMaRT Station materials recovery operation. We have evaluated your proposal to determine its diversion benefits and financial implications to the SMaRT Station partner cities. We have found that the additional diversion it would provide is marginal, but the additional costs would be significant. Thus, we must respectfully decline your proposal.

Very truly yours

Marvin A. Rose

Director of Public Works

Cc: Robert S. LaSala
Mark Bowers
Rich Gurney
Debi Sargent
Todd Storti
Cynthia Palacio
Russ Reiserer

## COST ANALYSIS-Current Contract vs. GT/Z Proposal Possible scenarios - Annual financial impacts

	Current tonnage, Current diversion	2 Diversion at maximum paid under contract	3 Incoming tonnage increase	Incoming tonnage decrease	5 Recyclables market value increase of 10%
Incoming tons MSW only	229,268	229,268	243,024	224,683	229,268
Increase/(decrease) %	· •	none	6.0%	-2.0%	none
Incoming tons source separated	20530	20530	21809	20530	20530
Increase/(decrease) % from current		none	6.2%	none	none
Diversion % - current	21.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%
Revenue split (GreenTeam:cities)	75:25	75:25	75:25	75:25	75:25
Diversion % - GT/Z proposal	21.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Revenue split (GreenTeam:cities)	93:7	93:7	93:7	93:7	93:7
Tons to Landfill - current	181,122	188,000	199,280	184,240	188,000
Tons to Landfill - proposal	181,122	183,414	194,419	179,746	183,414
SMaRT additional costs/(savings)	\$458,433	\$268,613	\$286,430	\$385,735	\$324,917
Sunnyvale's share of costs/(savings)	\$234,195	\$139,951	\$143,110	\$256,541	\$170,119
Mountain View's share of costs/(savings)	\$185,660	\$132,359	\$147,239	\$132,817	\$153,802
Palo Alto's share of costs/(savings)	\$38,577	(\$3,697)	(\$3,919)	(\$3,623)	\$997
Additional Revenue to GreenTeam	\$458,433	\$385,800	\$409,935	\$385,145	\$431,100

## Notes:

In each of the scenarios the difference between the current contract and the proposed is shown-changing the variables (incoming tonnage, diversion rate, change in market value) The assumption is made that GreenTeam will achieve the maximum diversion rate that has a revenue sharing value (i.e. if 20% = 93% revenue share, then 20% diversion will be achieved)

Column 2 reflects status quo between the two contracts

Palo Alto benefits from additional diversion (landfill savings) but does not share source separated recyclable \$

GreenTeam diversion July through Dec 2002 averaged 21.89%, January 2003 it is 18.6% (unaudited)

Savings in disposal (at current incoming MSW rate) between 18% and 20% diversion is \$220K annually (net of put or pay )

Put or pay amount is Sunnyvale's sole cost